

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

MATTHEW TRAVIS HOUSTON,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

REDENTA BLACIC, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:22-CV-1685 JCM (DJA)

ORDER

Presently before the court is *pro se* plaintiff Matthew Houston's motion to set aside this court's dismissal of the case. (ECF No. 28).

The court finds that further briefing on this motion is unnecessary. The motion substantively fails on its face because it is unintelligible. *See* (ECF No. 28). Even generously construing the motion, as the court does with all filings by *pro se* litigants, *see Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007), it makes no discernable request for relief.

The motion appears to be a document originally filed before Judge Gordon in another matter, and all plaintiff has done is cross out the previous date and case number. (ECF No. 28 at 1). It goes on to present a disjointed amalgamation of previously filed documents, none of which have any bearing on plaintiff's failure to file a renewed application to proceed *in forma pauperis* pursuant to Magistrate Judge Ferenbach's previous order. The motion fails to contend with the merits of the judgment it purports to challenge, and this court DENIES it as a result.

Despite the fact that judgment was entered and the case was closed on December 14, 2022, due to plaintiff's own failure to file a renewed application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, he continues to file plainly frivolous and unintelligible motions in this closed matter. Because these inexplicable and repetitive filings are wasteful of this court's time and resources, the court

1 directs the clerk to accept no further filings in this closed action save for documents related to
2 any possible appeal. *See, e.g., Ready Transp., Inc. v. AAR Mfg., Inc.*, 627 F.3d 402, 404 (9th Cir.
3 2010) (holding that district courts have inherent power to control their own dockets).

4 Accordingly,

5 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that defendant's motion to
6 set aside dismissal (ECF No. 28) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED.

7 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the clerk of the court is directed to accept no further
8 filings in this closed action.

9 DATED February 14, 2023.

10 
11 _____
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28